VOL. XIV. NO. 179.

"LIBERTY, THE UNION, AND THE CONSTITUTION."

WASHINGTON CITY, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 11, 1858.

The Washington Union.

TWO CENTS.

SENATOR HAMMOND AT HOME.

SPEECH OF HON. JAMES II. HAMMOND.

Delivered at Barnwell C. H., October 29, 1858. Delivered at Barmsell C. II., October 29, 1858.

I thank you very sincerely for this kind and cordial reception. To stand here and speak to the people of Barmsell remlads me of times long gone by. I have done it, I believe, but once in more than twenty years. But those were stirring times when, a quarter of a century ago, I so often spoke to you here of the constitution and the Union—of your rights and wrongs in this confederacy. No, not to you, but to your fathers. I am, indeed, happy to recognise in this assemblage many who were actors in those scenes; but many, many more, have been summoned hence, while you have grown up to supply their places. The gallant spirits who then surrounded me here, and whose kindling eyes and heaving bosoms animated and responded to my speech, have for the most part passed away; but the theme is still the same; and it is my part to-day, adhering with unchanged conviction and unabated zeal to every principle I then maintained to discourse upon the same great topics. Our

ar battle now. The lapse of thirty years has brought much experience The lapse of thirty years has brought much experience to the survivors of those who culisted for this great cause in South Carolina. The veil of what was then the future—a future covered with angry clouds and doubt and darkness—has been removed, and, looking back, we now see the events of long years which were unknown to us. The hard-fought fields; our chequered fortunes; our victories; our defeats; the dead, the living, all then deep buried in the womb of time, are now all clear and pulpable. And to those of us who have been spared to make this retrospect it is a proud satisfaction to know that time ble. And to those of us who have been spared to make this retrospect it is a proud satisfaction to know that time and events have proved that our principles were true and our cause just; to recognise the unflinching courage and overpowering ability with which they have been so long ined, and to feel renewed assurance that they must

Your fathers confided in me from the first moment that we met upon this spot. They took me in their arms and lifted me into all the high places that were within their reach; and I have had many proofs that they taught you to confide in me as they had done. For this great and generous and abiding confidence and trust I never knew but one reason—and that was, that I always told them the truth according to my best knowledge and belief. And as I dealt with them I shall deal with you.

The last legislature of the State conferred on me the high honor of a seat in the Senate of the United States, and during the late stormy session of Congress I in part sion, and produced such great excitement throughact of mine, save my course on that, I will take this oc-

casion to give my views in full upon it.

When, four years ago, the Kansas and Nebraska act
was passed, giving governments to those Territories, I was, like most of you, a private citizen. I was carnestly en-gaged in renovating old lands, and creating new out of morasses hitherto impenetrable, and I had as little desire or expectation of ever again taking a part in public affairs as the least ambitious of you here present. I made up my mind then that this bill was fraught with delusion and trouble to the South, and so expressed myself on all

The bill had two leading features in it. It enacted that The bill had two leading features in it. It enacted that every Territory, in forming its constitution for the purpose of applying for admission into the Union, should have the right to establish its own organic or constitutional laws, and come in with its own institutions, with the single condition that they should be republican. Why, unless our constitution is mere waste paper, all our institutions shauns, and our theory of self-government a fallacy, this principle and privilege is their essence; lies at the bottom of the whole, and constitutes the corner stone. It is the very right for which owe fathers fourth. stone. It is the very right for which our fathers fought and made a revolution. I might not have refused to re-affirm it—but it was supererogatory; it might well weaken the whole structure to dig up, for the purpose of verifi-

The other feature of the bill was the repeal of the Missouri-Compromise line. That was already repeated. It had long fulfilled its mission. It had calmed the troubled waters for a time. It was obsolete until ed the troubled waters for a time. It was obsolete than the annexation of Texas, when we acceded to the demand to extend it through the northern deserts of that State. But when California came—California that should have been, and may yet be, a slave State—and we demanded to extend that line to the Pacific, and thus secare for the South a portion of the magnificent territory purchased in part by her blood and treasure, it was refu-sed. Then that line was blotted out everywhere and forever. To repeal it was a mere formality. The Su-preme Court has recently pronounced it unconstitutional, and so the repeal was in no respect of any importance. But this bill, with these two features, neither of them of any practical importance, magnified and exaggerated ors and newspapers into a great southern victory.

led the South into the delusion that Kansas might be made a slave State, and induced it to join in a false and useless issue, which has kept the whole country in tur-moil for the last four years, and gave fresh life and vigor to the abolition party.

to the abolition party.

Through the most disgusting, as well as tragic scenes of fraud and force, the Territory of Kansas at last came before Congress for admission as a State, with what is known as the Lecompton constitution, imbodying slavery among its provisions. But at the same time the convention, by an ordinance, demanded of the United States some twenty-three millions of acres of kand, instead of the four millions usually allowed to new States containing public lands. It was almost certain that a majority of the people of Kansas were opposed to this constitution, but would not vote on it; and this additional nineteen millions, which if allowed would not vote be the constitution. millions, which, if allowed, would probably have kept them again from the recent polls, was what the South was expected to pay for that worthless slavery clause, which would have been annuled as expected to pay for that worthless slavery clause, which would have been annulled as soon as Kansas was admitted. I confess my opinion was that the South herself should kick that constitution out of Congress. But the South thought otherwise. When the bill for its adoption was framed, with what is called the Green proviso, I strenuously objected to it, and felt very much disposed to vote against the whole, but again gave up to the South, which accepted it by acclamation. If that proviso meant nothing, and so I interpreted it, it was nonsense and had no business there, being without precedent. If it could be made to mean anything, it must have been something wrong and dangerous. But, as I said, the South took that bill far and wide. The house rejected it. They passed then the Critgerous. But, as I said, the South took that bill he have wide. The house rejected it. They passed then the Crit-tenden substitute, which proposed to submit the Lecomp-ton constitution to a vote of the people of Kansas and to accept it, if ratified by them. The Senate had previously refused that substitute, and did so a second time. It then asked a committee of conference. That committee refused that substitute, and did so a second time. It then asked a committee of conference. That committee reported what is called the "English Bill." By that bill Congress accepted the Lecompton constitution pure and simple without proviso. The land ordinance of the Lecompton convention, which was in no wise a part of the constitution, but a separate measure, demanded, as I have said, a donation of some twenty-three millions of acres of land, being nineteen millions more than had been given to any other land State. The English bill cut this down to the usual amount of four millions of acres, and reto say other and State. The English bill cut this down to the usual amount of four millions of acres, and re-raired that the people of Kansas should ratify this modi-lation, and surrender all claim to the remainder of the lands, as the condition of her final admission. Such out of the public lands, that has been admitted into this Union—sometimes in the enabling act, and, where there was not one, always after accepting the constitution. Go to the statutes of Congress and you will find it in every one of them. It is the custom, it is necessary, and this feature in the English bill was in accordance with strict Procedent. The only difference is this: that usually the legislature of the State has been required to accept this compact by an irrevocable act; but in this case it was referred to the people of Kansas directly. In this there was no sacrifice of principle whatever, nor was it without precedent altogether, for in the case of the State last before admitted, Lowa, this question had been submitted to the legislature or the recole.

them to one representative under the federal apportionment. I voted for this bill; I voted properly; I voted no compromise; I sacrificed no particle of principle or southern interest. It is true, its phrascology is halting and bungling. It was drawn up hastily and in great excitement. I objected to the wording of it in several passages, but I assured myself that nothing sinister was designed, and I voted for it, leaving its authors responsible for its diction on the statute book. I thought it preferable to the first bill the Senate passed, and voted for it more willingly. It is true, some northern democrats who voted against the Senate bill voted for this, and thus it was carried. But was that a reason why I should not vote for it? Does that prove that I sacrificed any principle. They found themselves wrong, and perhaps wanted some excuse to retrace their steps. I was happy to assist in giving it to them without cost to ourselves. I was particularly pleased to get rid of the mysterious proviso of the first bill, and to require a solemn compact in regard to the public lands, which had not been properly provided for in that bill.

The only principle involved in this whole Kansas affair—if an affair so rotten, from beginning to end, can have a principle at all—was this: Would Congress admit a slave State into the Union? The Senate said yes. The House, by adopting the Crittenden substitute, said yes, if we are assured that a majority of the people of the

have a principle at all—was this: Would Congress admit a slave State into the Union? The Senate said yes. The House, by adopting the Crittenden substitute, said yes, if we are assured that a majority of the people of the State are in favor of it. For this substitute all the opposition voted in both houses, so that every member of Congress of all parties, first and last, committed himself to the principle and policy that a State should be admitted into the Union, with or without slavery, according to the will of its own people—thus re-enacting one feature of the Kansas and Nebraska bill. I should myself have been willing to rest there, and let Kansas rest also. Whatever there was of principle or honor in the matter was secured by the votes already given. The English bill, however, came up in due course, and I voted for it cheerfully, believing that it was better calculated than any that had been offered to close up this miserable business, which has furnished much the most disgraceful chapter so far in our history.

But it is said that, in submitting this land ordinance to a vote of the people of Kansas, Congress submitted also the Lecompton constitution, with its pro-slavery clause. If so, the passage in which it was done can surely be prolifed out. Balled chaven up as the bill is

also the Lecompton constitution, with its pro-slavery clause. If so, the passage in which it was done can surely be pointed out. Bally drawn up as the bill is, I should like to see the clause or the words that would justify such an assertion. If there was such a clause, why did not Judge Douglas and his friends vote for it? Why did not the black-republicans and all who voted for the Crittenden substitute, which submitted the constitution of the critical substitute, which submitted the constitution was the substitute. tion, vote for this bill? It was the very point they made, yet, to a man, they voted against it. That, I think, should be conclusive.

think, should be conclusive.

But then it is said it was a virtual submission of the constitution to the people, because, if they refused to ratify the modified land ordinance, the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton constitution was defeated. Well sas under the Lecompton constitution was defeated. Well, the facts are so; I cannot and do not deny them. But I should like to know how that could by any possibility have been avoided or remedied. Suppose Congress had admitted Kansas without modifying anything, yielding even to her enormous "land grab," which embraced many more acres than there are in all South Carolina, I should like to know if the Lecompton constitution would not still have been submitted to the people as virtually as it was by the English bill; that is, not submitted at all, but left with them-an inevitable ne essity. Congress could do no more, no less, no other ray. The constitution belonged to the people of Kan-us. Congress could not withhold it from them a moneut; nor could it make them organize under it, assem-ble their legislature, assume the position of a State, and send senators and representatives to Congress against their own will. Can Congress coerce a State into the Union? Then Congress can coerce a State to remain in the Union, or drive a State out of it. Congress is omnip-otent. But where are, then, the rights of the States? the Union, or drive a State out of it. Congress is omnip otent. But where are, then, the rights of the States Fortunately for us, the constitution of every State, and of every Territory asking to be a State, is not only virtually, but actually, in the hands of its people, at all times and under all circumstances, and they cannot be divested of that control without the atter destruction of the con

constitution without condition.

There are some who go still further and assert that, although there might be no way to avoid a submission of the Lecompton constitution to the control of the people of Kansas, yet that the conference bill was a compromise of principle, inasmuch as it specifically required them to act, and it made for them the definite opportunity to defeat the constitution as well as the ordinance. Now this is true, as a fact, yet the inference is absurd upon its very face. If Congress could not take the Lecompton constitution out of the hands of the people of Kausas, what difference did it make the lecompton. Kausss, what difference did it make whether they voted on the ordinance in August, under the direction of Con-gress, or at any other time, whether fixed by Congress or gress, or at any other time, whether fixed by Congress or themselves t August was agreed upon, because it was very well to set a time and let things cud. But from August to August, again and forever, this constitution was in the hands of the people of Kansas, and they could do with it what they pleased. True, Congress might have avoided that specific occasion and August vote by swallowing the land ordinance and all, and asking no security for the remainder of the mibil lands. but still kansas could have refused to organize as a State, and no power under our constitution could have interfered. It was all words and nothing more. Congress was charged with bribing Kansas to become slave State. But the bribe was by the conference bill four millions of acres of land, instead of twenty-three millions. If we had given her the whole twenty-three millions for the respect where where there three millions. If we had given her the whole twenty-three millions for her useless slavery clause, there might have been some ground for the charge. Yet it would have been of no avail, for Kansas could under no bribe or coercion known to our government have been compelled to accept the constitution or ordinance, or be-come a State against her will at any period whatever. I will not presume that any one is less proficient in consticome a State against her will at any period whatever. I will not presume that any one is less proficient in constitutional lore, or is less conversant with the history of congressional proceedings in the admission of new States, than myself. But I will say that I am incapable of comprehending them at all, if in this conference bill there was any "compromise" of southern principles or interests; any concession whatever by the South; any describes the contraction of the contraction of the contraction of the contraction. parture from the strictest construction of the constitu-tion; or any material deviation from the usual practice

The people of Kansas have, by an overwhelming majority, rejected the land ordinance as modified by Congress, and refused to come into the Union on such terms. Be it so, It is what I expected—what I rather desired. It sorts precisely with what I felt when I saw Kansas thrust herself into Congress and demand—reeking with blood and fraud—to be enrolled among the States. Let her stay out. I am opposed to her coming in before she has the requisite population; not because she will be a free State, but because I fully approved of the prohibitory clause of the prohibitory State, but because I fully approved of the prohibitory clause of the conference bill, and for that reason voted against the admission of Oregon. Unless in exceptional cases, such as that of Kansas was last winter, I do not think that a State should be admitted with less population than would entitle her to a member of the House. It is not just to the other States, and is not consonant with the theory of our government.

sorted what is called the "English Bill." By that bill gress accepted the Lecompton constitution pure and uple without proviso. The land ordinance of the Leapton convention, which was in no wise a part of the apton convention, which was in no wise a part of the estatution, but a separate measure, demanded, as I have d, a donation of some twenty-three millions of acres of d, being nineteen millions more than had been given the usual amount of four millions of acres, and retreat that the people of Kansas should ratify this modition, and surrender all claim to the remainder of relation, and surrender all claim to the remainder of relation, and surrender all claim to the remainder of the people of Kansas should ratify this modition, as the condition of her final admission. Such equisition has been made on every new State, carved to the public lands, that has been admitted into this ion—scenetimes in the enabling act, and, where there is not one, always after accepting the constitution. Go these statutes of Congress and you will find it in every of them. It is the custom, it is necessary, and this ture in the English bill was in accordance with strict scelent. The only difference is this: that usually legislature of the State has been required to accept a sompact by an irrevocable act; but in this case it as referred to the people of Kansas directly. In this was no sacrifice of principle whatever, nor was without precedent altogether, for in the case of State last before admitted, lows, this question been submitted to the legislature or the people. It is not in the case of the English bill, except that it further have an about to accept that the was in accordance with the residuation of the Union, and I openly avowed it. I have a submitted to the legislature or the people, do not seek disunion, and will not seek it as a primary object, however promptly they may accept it as an actificed or in the constitutional proper in the constitutional proper in the constitutional proper in the constitutional proper in the const

its action in all great affairs. It may be well asked how I can entertain such views and expectations, when within these few years the South has lost her equality in the Senate, and the free States have at length a decided majority in both houses of Congress, while this unfortunate Kansas contest has swept into their political graves so many of our ancient friends in those States that it may be doubted whether they have at this moment, after the recent elections—the finale of the disastrous Kansas abortion—a majority in any single one of them; and there seems to be at present no prospect of our extending the

seems to be at present no prospect of our extending the area of slavery in any quarter.

These facts are true; and if you will bear with me, I will place them all in the strongest light I can before you—for it is of the utmost importance that we should at least see clearly how we stand, and what are our resources, in order to form an idea of what we can do, and at least see clearly now we stand, and what are our resources, in order to form an idea of what we can do, and how avoid wasting our strength on what cannot be accomplished. The equality of the free and slave States has long been lost in the House; by the admission of California it was lost in the Senate. Since then another free State has been admitted, and another yet has passed the Senate, and in a few years more we shall have Kansas, Nebraska, Washington, New Mexico, and perhaps others on our roll. The immigration from Europe to the North is sufficient to form one or more new States every year. To the South there is literally no endgration. We have, since the closing of the slave trade, added to our people, and we have no surplus population, white or black, to colonize new States. We lost Kansas partly by our inability to colonize it, and we are perhaps yet to have a struggle for a portion of Texas. The idea, then, of recovering the equality of the two sections, even in the Senate, seems remote indeed. We have it proposed to re-open the African slave trade, and bring in hordes of slaves from that prolific region to restore the balance. I once entertained that idea myself, but on further investigation. bring in hordes of slaves from that prolific region to re-store the balance. I once entertained that idea myself, but on further investigation I abandoned it. I will not now go into the discussion of it, further than to say that the South is itself divided on that policy, and, from appearances, opposed to it by a vast majority, while the North is unanimously against it. It would be impossible to get Congress to re-open the trade. If it could be ne, then it would be unnecessary, for that result could only be brought about by such an entire abandonment by the North and the world of all opposition to our slave system, that we might safely cease to erect any defences for it. But if we could introduce slaves, where could we find suitable territory for new slave States? The indian Reserve, west of Arkansas, might make one. But we have solemply guarantied that to the remnants of the red race. Everywhere else, I believe, the of the red race. Everywhere else, I believe, the borders of our States have reached the great desert which separates the Atlantic from the Pacific States of this confederacy. Nowhere is African slavery likely to flourish in the little oasis of that Sahara of America. It is much more likely, I think, to get the Facitic slope, and to the north in the great valley, than anywhere else outside of its present limits. Shall we, as some suggest, take Mexico and Central America to make slave States? African slavery appears to have failed Perhaps, and most probably, it will never suc Indians, and the two or three millions of Creole Spaniards and mongre's who now hold those countries? We would not enslave the Indians? Experience has proven that they are incapable of steady labor, and are therefore unfit for slavery. We would not exterminate them, even if that inhuman achievement would not cost ages of mur-der and incalculable sums of money. We could hardly think of attempting to plant the black race there, supechink of attempting to plant the black race there, superior for labor, though inferior perhaps in intellect, and expect to maintain a permanent and peaceful industry, such as slave labor must be, to be profitable, amid those idle, restless, demonalized children of Montezuma, scarcely more civilized, perhaps more sunk in superstition, than in his age, and now trained to civil war by halfa century of incessant revolution. What I war by half a century of incessant revolution. What, I say, could we do with these people or these countri-to add to southern strength? Nothing. Could we do grade ourselves so far as to annex them on equal terms, they would be sure to come into this Union free States all. To touch them in any way is to be contaminated. England and France, I have no doubt, would gladly see us take this burden on our back, if we would secure we have to do with them. If we cannot get it by negotiation or by purchase, we must seize and hold it by force of arms. The law of nations would justify it, and it is absolutely necessary for our Pacific relations. The presont condition of those unhappy States is certainly deplo-rable, but the good God holds them in the hollow of His hand and will work out their proper destinies.

We might expand the area of slavery by acquiring cuba, where African slavery is already established. Mr. Calhoun, from whose matured opinions, whether on constitutional principles or southern policy, it will rarely be found safe to depart, said that Cuba was "forbidden fruit" to us, unless plucked in an exigency of war. There is no reasonable ground to suppose that we can acquire it in any other way; and the war that will open to us such an occasion will be great and general, and bring about results that the keenest intellect cannot now anticipate. But if we had Cuba we could not make more than two or three slave trade closed, and her only resort for slaves to this continent, she would, besides crushing out our whole sugar culture by her competition, afford in a few years a mar-ket for all the slaves in Missouri, Kentucky, and Maryland. ket for all the slaves in Missouri, Kentucky, and Maryland. She is, notwithstanding the exorbitant taxes imposed on her, capable now of absorbing the annual increase of all the slaves on this continent, and consumes, it is said, twenty to thirty thousand a year by her system of labor. Slaves decrease there largely. In time, under the system practised, every slave in America might be externimated in Cuba as were the Indians. However the idle African may procreate in the tropics, it yet remains to be proven, and the facts are against the conclusion, that he can, in those regions, work and thrive. It is said Cuba is to be "Africanized" rather than that the United States should take her. That threat, which at one time was somewhat alarming, is no longer any cause of disquietude to the South, after our experience of the Africanizing of to the South, after our experience of the Africanizing of St. Domingo and Jamaica. What have we lost by that? I think we reaped some beneat; and, if the slaves of Cuba are turned loose, a great sugar culture would grow up in Louisiana and Texas, rivalling that of cotton, and diverting from it so much labor that cotton would rarely be below its present price.

You must not suppose for a moment that I am opposed You must not suppose for a moment that I am opposed to "the expansion of the area of African slavery." On the centrary, I believe that God created negroes for no other purpose than to be "the hew re of wood and drawers of water"—that is, to be slaves of the white race; and I wish to see them in that capacity on every spot on the surface of the globe where their labor is necessary or beneficial. Nor do I doubt that such will be the final result. Much less would I oppose the acquisition of territory that would place the slave States on a numerical equality, and more, with the free States in the Union. But this review and scrutiny of the resources of the South shows, I think, pretty conclusively, that we have not now the surplus population, nor suitable territory within set the contrary, I believe that God created negroes for no other purpose that the three rise of word and drawed of the shaves in the tens of the shaves in the little shave in the tens of the shaves in the little shave in the little shave in the shave in the little shave in the little shave in the shave in the little shave i

about the dangers that beset her, when she might glory in her strength and hurl defiance to her enemies. But it is said that, with a fixed and overwhelming free-State majority against us in this Union, with all our natural advantages, we must dissolve the connection to insuratour resent safety and accomplish our proper destiny. Perhaps so. But permit me to suggest, not yet. The dissolution of the Union is an alternative that we have always at command, and for which we should be ever ready; but a peaceful, properous, and powerful people may not challenge Fate a day too soon. The question still remains, can the free States be brought to concur permanently in any line of policy that will subtion still remains, can the free States be brought to con-cur permanently in any line of policy that will sub-vert the constitution, and seriously damage the South in this confederacy? I do not believe that they can. Beckless as is political ambition, and insane as fanati-cism ever is, I have no idea that the free States can-be consolidated on the wild project of ruling the slave-holders by mere brute numbers, either through the ballot box or by force of arms; whether to emanci-pate out slaves or strip us of the fruits of their labor; or to govern us with the mildness and paternal care

or to govern us with the mildness and paternal care due to inferiors. The nervous in the South, and the abolition demagogues of the North, may believe it. But when it comes to the actual test, if neither sober sust nor patriotism should prevail, the sense of danger and the love of cotton and tobacco would, with our northern brethren, in every crisis, over-ride their love of negroes. On this I think you may depend, despite the insolent boasts of the abolitionists of what they will do when they get the government in their hands. The North has only to be made clearly sensible how far she can go, and what the South will not submit to. She will not and what the South will not submit to. She will not trespass beyond that, but will content herself with the glory of carrying the alternate bleunial elections, as she has just done—always leaving it to the democracy to car-ry that which makes the President.

But I am making mere assertions. Allow me, then, to refer to facts to show the past power of the South in this Union, and the present state of the great questions in which she is most deeply interested. When, thirty years ago, we began this arduous conflict for the constitutional reform of this government and the security of the South, the South herself was thoroughly divided. The tariff, the bank, the internal improvement system—nay, even abolition itself—all had the sanction of a large number of our meta prominent conthern man. If they did not all our most prominent southern men. If they did not all originate, they were all resuscitated, in that era of in-fatuation, when a southern President proclaimed that we were "all federalists, all republicans," when southern statesmen sneered at State rights, and the constitution be

came for a time a dead letter.

The tariff of 1828 levied average duties of more than The tariff of 1828 levied average duties of more than forty per cent. on all our imports. By the tariff of 1857 the average of duties was reduced below twenty per cent. We have accomplished that much; and, besides, the principle of free trade is pretty generally conceded now throughout the Union. It cannot be denied that this is a great success. I think the duties should be reduced still lower; and particularly that the discriminations against the agricultural interests should be abol ished. But it is supposed that there will be a demand for their increase at the next session. If so, it will of course be resisted, and I trust successfully. Free trade is the plantation States should discard any government that made a protective tariff its policy. They should not sub-mit to pay tribute for the support of any other industrial system than their own; much less to make good the hubble speculations of another section of the Union. Unequal texation is, after all, what we have most to fear it this Union, and against that we must be always ready to

this Union, and against that we must be always ready to adopt the most decisive measures.

The internal improvement system was in full vigor in 1828. Inaugurated also by southern men, it absorbed all the surplus of the treusury, and being in its nature unlimited, it was capable of absorbing all the revenue that could be extorted by the highest possible tariff. That, too, if not destroyed, has been checked and crippled by southern action. It is true that it still appears annually in Congress—but the once haughty brigand is now little more than a sturdy beggar.

We had then, also, in full operation, a Bank of the United States, with branches in all our principal cities. It received and speculated on all the revenues of the government, and controlled and concentrated in the North all the exchanges, thus levying a per centage upon every

all the exchanges, thus levying a per centage upon every commercial transaction of the South. That has been ancommercial transaction or the South. That has been an-nihilated. It sleeps the sleep that knows no walking. But let me say that the system which it established still exists. Despite of its destruction by the federal gov-ernment, and the collection of the revenue in specie, our exchanges still centre in the North, and our otherwise stable industry is still compelled to participate more or less in all the reckless speculations of that functical sec-tion—more fanatical in its love of money than oven in its devotion to negroes. But this is a self-imposed vassalage. Through the privileges which our southern legis-latures have granted to our innumerable banks we are made tributary to New York, which is itself tributary to London, the great world centre of exchanges in our age.

Thus has the South, by her energy and ability, disposed of the capital grivances against which she protested, with almost hair nor puone men against its, 1828. During this time our opponents have twice wrested the government from us, and inflicted other injuries, but they were soon stripped of their power and their acts repealed. Only four times since the organization of this government has the North had possession of it, and in each case only for one term. The North has never united long on any policy. The injuries inflicted on the South have been mainly inflicted by her own ambitious, South have been mainly inflicted by her own ambitious, factious, and divided public men, and our history proves that no man and no measure has yet been strong enough to stand against the South when united. I believe none

ever will.

But it is thought that the abolitionists' supposition, still credited by some of this country, will inevitably get the power of this government permanently into their hunds, and, backed by the opinion of the world, use it for our destruction. Let us consider what are the facts. From the time that the wise and good Las Casas first in-From the time that the wise and good Las Cass first in-troduced into America the institution of African slavery— I say institution, because it is the oldest that exists, and will. I believe, survive all others that now flourish—it has had its enemies. For a long while they were chiefly men of peculiar and eccentric religious notions. Their first prac-tical and political success arose from the convulsions of the French revolution, which lost to that empire of the French revolution, which lost to that empire its best colony. Next came the prohibition of the slave trade—the excitement of the Missouri Compromise in this country, and then the deliberate emancipation of the slaves in their colonies by the British government in 1833—'4. About the time of the passage of that act the abolition agitation was revived again in this country, and abolition societies were formed. I remember the time well, and some of you de also. And what then was the state of opinion in the South? Washington had emancipated his slaves. Jefferson had bitterly denounced the system, and had done all be could to destroy it. Our Clays, Marshalls, Crawfords, and many other prominent southern men, had led off in the colonization scheme. The inevitable effect in the South was that she believed slavery to be an evil—weakness—dis-

how stands it now? Why, in this very quarter of a century, our slaves have doubled in numbers, and each slave has more than doubled in value. The very negro who, as a prime laborer, would have brought four hundred dollars in 1828, would now, with thirty more years upon him, sell for eight hundred dollars. What does all this mean? Why, that for ourselves we have settled this question of emancipation against all the world in theory and practice, and the world must accept our solution. The only inquiry is, how long this new-found superstition will survive, and how far it may carry its votaries elsewhere? What changes in production, in commerce, in sciety, or government it may effect? For production, commerce, seciety, and government must yield and change whenever they come in contact with the great fundamental principle of the subsrdination of the inferior to the superior manas made by God; and especially of the colored to the white races. It is, I say, only through the evits that this superstition may bring upon other peoples, and especially white races. It is, I say, only through the evils that this superstition may bring upon other peoples, and especially on those of the North and of Europe, with whom we are so closely connected, that the South can be materially damaged by it, standing, as she now does, firm, assured, united. How, then, is it with others?

Permit me to say that, in my opinion, the tide of abolition famaticism has begun to ebb everywhere, and will never rise again. When the English freed the negroes in their colonies, it was not wholly a sentimental move-

ment, dictated by political radicals and the saints of Exeter Hall. Her statesmen, in their ignorance, thought that what is called free labor—that is, "wages slavery"—would succeed in tropical culture as well or better than slave labor. In their arrogance they believed also that all the world must follow their example in this silly scheme of abolition; and that from her great wealth and world-encircling colonies the monopoly of cotton and sugar culture would fall into the hands of England. Nature, and the indomitable spirit and intellect of the South, have disappointed all their calculations. The South still flourishes, and cotton and sugar, and coffee and rice and tobacco, are still the heritage of the slaveand rice and tobacco, are still the heritage of the slave-

holders.

Galled by their utter dependence upon us for cotton, without the free use of which they would both tumble into rain in a day, England and France, who, in their frequent frenzies, at length destroyed all their colonies by emancipation, have ransacked the universe to find climes and soils adapted to the cheap growth of this great staple. great agricultural staples, sugar, rice, tobacco, coffee, can never be produced as articles of wide extended commerce, except by slave labor. This they at length found out. But such labor they had repudiated everywhere. No, not everywhere. Not in France nor in Great Britain, not everywhere. Not in France nor in Great Britain, where they still hold sacred splendid thrones and palmy aristocracies amid starving laborers; only for outside barbarians they ordained freedom and equality; but failing in all their schemes, and finding that, with all their costly expenditures and high sounding manifestoes, they had simply ruined their own colonies, and made themselves the vassals of the slaveholders what have they done? Why, renewed the slave trade. Not in name. Oh, no! Exeter Hall and the Par-liament houses still thunder executions against that; while the colonists, under governmental protection, and with English money, wrung by taxation from her "wages slaves," are importing by hundreds of thousands Chinese and Hindoo coolies, under conditions com pared with which Algerine slavery of the last century was merciful. They do not hold them as we do our hold them as we do our in sickness and health, in slaves, for better for salves, for better for the salves and heater, in their prime of life they seduce them from their homes, transport them to distant and unwholesome climes; for the merest pittance of wages consume their best years in the severest labors, and then turn them out to die-the direct slavery that brutal man has ever instituted. France, less sensitive—having no Exeter Hall-embracing the same scheme-resorts to Africa, and openly makes purchases, for so they may called, from slave catchers; nay, she buys from the P ident of Liberia, the far-famed settlement of our own Col onization Society; buys the colonists, our own emanci-pated slaves, who, sick of freedom, prefer any form of slavery, and in their desperation do not hesitate to make their pious patrons in this country the laughing-steek of the whole world.

doption of this abolition crotchet alone made it respect able and influential—have thoroughly renounced it, practically, and almost in theory. The press of England, perhaps the greatest power of the world, sustains these movements; while in France the newspapers are openly discussing the question of importing negro slaves, by name, into Algeria. I think it may be fairly said that in Europea abolition has run its course. Brougham in Europe abolition has run its course. Brougham, Palmerston, Russell, and all the old political agitators, Falmerston, Ressell, and all the old political agitators, are hanging their harps upon the willows. Even the son of Wilberforce, the fanatic, approves of coolie slavery, which we abhor. But recently the British government openly surrendered its claim to the right of scarch—a claim set up mainly to put down the African slave trade, and without which all attempts to do it will probably be idle. And there is nothing to surprise us in all this, if we are correct in our views of African slavery. If it is sustained by the religion of the Bible; if neither humanity nor sound philosophy oppose it; if, as we are convinced, it is a social, political, and economical benefit to the world, then it was inevitable that, sooner or later, the abolition crusade must die out—and why not now? at which all attempts to do it will probably be

If there is truth in what I have stated to you—if the abolition fever has nearly or quite exhausted itself in Europe—if time and facts have proved there that it is an absurdity—it seems to me we should not doubt that its career is about to close here. Such is my opinion, however differently those may think who judge only by appearances, or take their cues from agitating politicians. I ask any one to tell me upon what measure or upon what man the abolitionists of this country can ever again muster their legions as they did in 1856? Kansas is squeezed dry. It stinks in the nostrils of all people. They can do no more there. Will they try a "cry" against the Supreme Court for the Dred Scott decision? What is there in that to inflame popular sentiment? It is always do no more there. Will they try a "cry" against the Supreme Court for the Dred Scott decision? What is there in that to inflame popular sentiment? It is always up-hill business to agitate against a judiciary, but especially against the Supreme Court of the United States, which the northern people have been taught to revere as the bulwark of their liberties. Will they demand the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia? They have ever been able to do much with that, though they have often tried. That issue is a little too practical and too dangerous. Not many are bold enough to embark in it. They might as well make the question of disunion nakedly. Will they take up the abstract, and, probably, never again to be other than abstract, proposition of "no more slave States?" They have done it. They have already split upon it. The Northwest will not take it, and the free States, as bottom, all want Cuba. They love molasses, and hanker after free trade with that rich island. Where, then, are they to go, I cannot see. They do not appear to see themselves. Will any one state the practical question, if we offer them none—and we have none to offer—on which they are next to rally for the conquest of the South? The measure or the man? It does seem to me that this great fire is dying out for wart of field; that this crusade, as many crusades have done, has exhausted itself, and that there is no argument or leader that can keep it alive. Their Feter Hermits, their Godfreys, their Baldwins, their lion-hearted Richards—where are they? It seems that they will scarcely agree even cather it is a seem to me that they who shall lead their last pious campuign

15 auditor

Eight lines or less make a square, longer advertisements in a proportion, and all payable in advance. Advertisements orders twice or thrice a week will be charged 37, costs per square for a insertion after the first. Advertisements once a week in the daily conta per square for each insertion. Special notices charged do the foregoing rates.

We must be prepared, I say, to take care of ourselves, whatever may come. It is clear that the slaveholding States of this confederacy, whatever hazards they may choose to incur by remaining in alliance with a majority of non-slaveholders now so inflamed against them, must ever and at all times hold their deatinies in their own hands. They can never permit any foreign power to legislate in reference to their peculiar industrial system, whether to abolish or to modify, or impose undue burdenson it. Such legislation must be resisted with all our means, and without regard to any consequences. If it should so happen that the free States of this Union, being now, and always to be, in a majority, do establish a political line between the two sections and the two systems of labor, legislate upon it and maintain it, then they will constitute a power as foreign to us as any nation in the world, and we cannot submit to it. Whatever the weak and defenceless colonies of other countries may have submitted to, before these southern States will be placed in the condition of St. Dominge or Jannaics, or one at all approximating to it, they will rend this Union into fragments and plunge the world in ruin. It is in their power to do both, for the world cannot got on without them; and if ruthless fanaticism and brute force combine, under whatever names, and with whatever authority, to ride them down, they will carry with them the pillars of the temple of civilization, and force a common fate on all mankind.

There are many who believe that some such a catastrophe is inevitable. It cannot be denied that, from appearances here and elsewhere, it is entirely possible, and it may not be unwise for all of us to suppose it probable. Although I think that the ranks of our enemies are broken and the moral victory won, I am far from proclaiming that the battle is over, and that we have now

broken and the moral victory won, I am far from pro-claiming that the battle is over, and that we have now caiming that the factic is over, and that we have now only to gather the fruits of our success. Many a battle has been won and lost again by overweening confidence, by reckless pursuit, or by turning aside for the sake of spoil. Let us fall into none of these errors; for we are still in the very heat and turmoil of this great conflict, and all might yet be lost. What I wish to impress upon you is, that there is hope for effort—triumph for union, everywear and persevence.

energy, and perseverance.

It has fallen upon the slaveholders of the South to conduct this question of African slavery to its final concludue this question of African slavery to its final conclu-duct this question of African slavery to its final conclu-sion. Such is our fate. It is inevitable. Let us cheer-fully accept and manfully perform our destined parts, and do it with no distrust of God, with no misglyings of our do it with no distrust of God, with no misgivings of our cause or of ourselves; with no panic; no foodsh attempt to fly from dangers which cannot be avoided, which have not been proven to be insurmountable, and which I, for one, believe that we can conquer. After what has been achieved by a divided South, now that it is almost theroughly united, now that we have a President and his cab-inet, a majority in both houses of Congress, a Supreme Court of the United States, and still hosts of allies in the free States, all substantially concurring with us in our construction of the constitution, and, under its obliga-tions, earnestly battling with us for the maintenance of our rights and interests, we owe it to our country, to ourselves, to the world, and to posterity to cast aside all weak fears, all petty or impracticable issues, all mere wrangling and vituperation, personal and sectional, and wranging and vituperation, personal and sectional, and the calimess of undoubted courage to the overthrow of every false theory of government, and every sentimental scheme for organizing labor, carrying with us the constitution of our fathers, and, if we can, their Union.

But the slave States, constituting, and as I think forever to constitute, a numerical minority, can, however, accomplish nothing in this Union without the aid of faithful allies in the free States. It has been of late too much the habit in the South to mistrust all such allies—to disparage, to denounce, and drive them from us. Nothing

parage, to denounce, and drive them from us. Nothing could be more unwise or more unjust. It is distrusting the truth and justice of our own cause, or calumniating human nature, to doubt that there are in the free States thousands of sound thinking, true-hearted and gallant men, who concur essentially in our views, and are ready to make common cause with us; nay, it is falsifying history and fact. During the late session I saw men acting tory and fact. During the late session I saw men acting cordially and vigorously with us against the positive in-structions of their excited constituents at the hazard of political martyrdom; and in two instances that martyr-dom was consummated before the adjournment. Shall we do no honor to such men? Shall we pay no tribute to such heroic devotion to truth, to justice, and the con-stitution? Shall we revise them in company with all stitution? Shall we revile them in common with all northern men, because many revile and some have betrayed us? To be truly great we must be not only just, generous and forbearing with all mankind. Let us place ourselves in the situation of northern public men in this great contest, consider their dangers and responsibilities, and, making every allowance for human weakness, do homage to the brave and faithful. And this leads no to say that, having nover been a mere party politician, intriguing and whre-pulling to advance myself or others, I am not learned in the rubric of the thousand slang, unmeaning, and usually files party

the thousand slang, unmeaning, and usually false party names to which our age gives birth. But I have been given to understand that there are to be two parties in the South, called "National" and "State Rights Demointo our ranks with open arms, and cordially embrace and promote according to his morits, every honest free-State man who reads the constitution as we do, and will co-operate with us in its maintenance, then I belong to that party, call it as you may, and I should grieve to find a southern man who did not. But, on the other hand, having been all my life, and

But, on the other hand, having been all my life, and being still, an ardent "State-rights" man—belleving "State-rights" to be an essential, nay, the essential element of the constitution, and that no one who thinks otherwise can stand on the same constitutional platform that I do—it seems to me that I am, and all those with whom I act habitually are, if democrats at all, true "State-rights democrats." Nothing in public affairs so perplexes and annoys me as these absard party names, and I never could be interested in them. I could easily comprehend two great parties, standing on the two great antagonistic principles which are inderent in all things human: the right and the wrong, the good and the evil, according to the peculiar views of each individual; and was never at a loss to find my side, as now, in what are known as the democratic and republican parties of this country. But democratic and republican parties of this country. But the minor distinctions have, for the most part, seemed to me to be factitions and factious, gotten up by cunning men for selfish purposes, to which the true patriot and houest man should be slow to lend himself. For myself, and for you, while I represent you, I shall go for the constitution strictly construed and faithfully carried out. I will make my fight, such as it may be, by the side of